

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 206

SO 028 744

AUTHOR Laney, James D.; Wimsatt, T. Joy; Moseley, Patricia A.
TITLE Teachers' Impressions of YESS!/Mini-Society Before and After
Program Implementation: An Action Research Report.
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28,
1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; *Active Learning; Educational Change;
Elementary Education; Experiential Learning; *Inservice
Education; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement;
*Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on nine inservice elementary teachers who received training in the Youth Empowerment and Self-Sufficiency (YESS)!/Mini-Society program at the beginning of the 1996-97 school year. The purpose of the project was to explore these teachers' impressions of the program before and after program implementation. All subjects participated in a 2-day workshop to introduce the program. Each teacher completed a written questionnaire about his/her impressions of the program immediately after the workshop and again after 30 sessions of program implementation. Overall, teachers' impressions of YESS!/Mini-Society were very positive before and after program implementation. Teacher's fears/concerns centered around the complexity/sophistication of the program, the comprehensiveness of the program, and time allotments in the classroom. Recommendations are made for further training and implementation programs. Eleven tables present the findings for the questions on the survey. (EH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

**TEACHERS' IMPRESSIONS OF YESS!/MINI-SOCIETY
BEFORE AND AFTER PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:
AN ACTION RESEARCH REPORT**

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association,
Economic Education Special Interest Group,
March 27, 1997

by
James D. Laney, Ed.D.
T. Joy Wimsatt, M.Ed.
Patricia A. Moseley, PhD.

Department of Teacher Education and Administration
College of Education
University of North Texas
P.O. Box 13857
Denton, Texas 76203-6857

(817) 565-2922
FAX (817) 565-4952
Internet: laney @coefs.coe.unt.edu

James D. Laney is an associate professor, T. Joy Wimsatt is an adjunct instructor, and Patricia A. Moseley is a professor in the Department of Teacher Education and Administration, College of Education, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas. Dr. Laney is a certified teacher-trainer for the YESS!/Mini-Society program.

SO 028 744

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

James D. Laney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy

TEACHERS' IMPRESSIONS OF YESS!/MINI-SOCIETY
BEFORE AND AFTER PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:
AN ACTION RESEARCH REPORT

Kourilsky (1995) calls for the development of curricula to meet the demand for entrepreneurship education. Citing a national poll of high school students, small business owners, and the general public conducted by Gallop, Kourilsky notes that all surveyed groups expressed a strong interest in starting and running their own businesses. Sixty-nine percent of high school students voiced this opinion, and they indicated their primary motivations to be independence (73%) and being able to give something back to the community that supported their entrepreneurship ventures (68%). The poll also indicated that 76% of high school students rated their knowledge of entrepreneurship as being very poor to fair, a self-assessment which seems to be accurate given that these same students correctly responded to only 44% of the basic knowledge of entrepreneurship questions they were asked.

In addition to the obvious demand for entrepreneurship education described above, Kourilsky (1995) gives two other reasons for the importance of entrepreneurship education. First, educational access to the make-a-job option rather than the take-a-job mentality is essential for the career success of at-risk youth, who are less likely to have access to entrepreneurship role models and knowledge, and of middle and upper socio-economic status youth, who otherwise might land in arbitrary, passionless jobs for which they are overqualified and underpaid relative to their level of education. Second, the future trend is toward economic growth driven by small businesses rather than large corporations. Small businesses will provide this economic growth through the creation of jobs and innovative products and services.

As described by Kourilsky (1996A, 1996B), the Youth Empowerment and Self-Sufficiency (YESS!)/Mini-Society curriculum is an experience-based program for teaching children, ages 8-12, entrepreneurship concepts. There are three main goals for the program. First, the program provides children with opportunities to experience entrepreneurship in a real-world setting. Second, the program teaches entrepreneurship concepts in the context of real-life experiences. Third, the program integrates entrepreneurship education with other subjects including language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Critical thinking, problem-solving, practical arts, and cooperative learning are fostered as children resolve personal and societal dilemmas in interdisciplinary ways.

The original Mini-Society curriculum focussed on economic concepts and was created by Marilyn Kourilsky, a former UCLA economic educator, in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Kourilsky is now Vice President of the Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership Inc., Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, in Kansas City, Missouri. Her revised YESS!/Mini-Society curriculum is presented in a modular format and focusses primarily on entrepreneurship concepts, but it is not limited to these concepts. Other curricular modules within the program include economics, government/law/ethics, and inventions (i.e. creativity and new product development).

YESS!/Mini-Society is usually implemented for at least ten weeks, with three sessions per week and with each session lasting approximately one hour. The instructional system is initiated with a classroom scarcity situation. The concept of scarcity refers to a situation with relatively unlimited wants versus limited resources and is the central economic problem of every society. Within an interaction discussion group, students eventually resolve the scarcity problem

though the use of the market mechanism allocation strategy. Students develop a list of activities for which they will be paid in Mini-Society currency, and this currency is used to bid for scarce resources and settle the question of who gets them. Soon, students begin to buy and sell goods and services. They open businesses or become salaried workers in a classroom marketplace.

Within the classroom marketplace described above, students experience adult life in microcosm. Each market day/period is followed by a formal, on-the-spot debriefing of a predictable dilemma stemming from children's market day experiences. In each debriefing, children's market day experiences serve as the basis for an inquiry-oriented lesson. The teacher focusses children's attention on concepts and ideas, derived from their experiences, that can aid them in their quest to resolve dilemmas. Within the entrepreneurship module, debriefings on entrepreneurial themes and concepts include the following:

- Should I Become an Entrepreneur? (Opportunity Recognition)
- Unmasking the Customer (Target Market)
- How Do I Know Anybody Will Buy My Product? (Market Survey, Demand, Risk Taking and Entrepreneurship)
- "WIIFM?"-Based Promotion (Promotion Strategies)
- How Do I Get to the Starting Line? (Expenses of Starting a Business)
- We're in the Money! Or Are We? (Sources of Capital)
- But It Was My Idea! (Competition vs. Monopoly)
- Should I Hire My Buddy? (Price/Productivity and Comparative Advantage)
- Stay Tuned for "The Price Is Right!" (Pricing and Break-Even Analysis)
- Keeping Records, Starring "Sales and Expenses"

- Winning the "Go With the Flow!" Game (Cash Flow)
- I've Grown Allergic to My Partner (Specialization, Gentlemen's Agreements and Legal Contracts)
- Venturing Out From Mini-Society (Business Plan)

The program described above is well-grounded in teaching-learning theory. Kourilsky (1996B) and Kourilsky & Carlson (in press) cite three major principles upon which the program is based. First, personal involvement is better than vicarious involvement in enhancing students' learning. Second, students' learn more when they have active roles rather than passive roles in the learning experience/environment. Third, when students have the opportunity to make decisions and bear consequences, learning is more meaningful and memorable.

Empirical research on the program has demonstrated the many benefits for students participating in the program. These benefits include (1) increased economic understanding, (2) increased feelings of autonomy, (3) improved attitudes toward school and learning, improved self-concept, (4) less stereotypical images of people in entrepreneurial roles, (5) more assertiveness, (6) greater willingness to take moderate risks (a characteristic necessary for success in any business venture), (7) increased use of cost-benefit analysis in personal decision making situations, and (8) achievement gains in mathematics and reading/language arts (Kourilsky, no date; Kourilsky, 1976; Kourilsky, 1977; Kourilsky & Graff, 1986; Kourilsky & Hirschleifer, 1976).

At least one empirical study has focussed on teachers' implementation of Mini-Society. Kourilsky (1979) found that non-intervention, as opposed to overt and covert intervention, was the best teaching strategy to be used in conjunction with program implementation. Students in

non-interventionist teachers' classrooms outperformed students in overt and covert interventionist teachers' classrooms on measures of economic concept acquisition and students' feelings of autonomy.

Another study by Kourilsky (1993) tested a model of teacher training in conjunction with Kourilsky's KinderEconomy program, the experience-based YESS! curriculum for children ages 5 to 12. The training integrated three instructional strategies--a curriculum that is experience-based, instruction based on the Generative Model of Teaching and the Generative Model of Mislearning and Recovery, and assessment using the Information Referenced Testing (IRT) procedure. Teachers participating in the training increased their confidence levels in economics information from 54% to 89% and achieved an average final economic literacy score of 97.5%.

Other than the studies cited above, little research has been done on teachers' training in or implementation of Youth Empowerment and Self-Sufficiency (YESS!) curricula, such as YESS!/Mini-Society. In order to improve teacher training and program implementation, more research is needed as Kourilsky's revised YESS!/Mini-Society curriculum begins to be disseminated across the country on an ever-expanding basis.

According to the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation's *1996 Annual Report*, YESS!/Mini-Society is currently active in thirty-six states. Seventeen universities have received grants to train inservice elementary teachers in how to implement the program. Across the United States, nearly six hundred teachers have taught and twenty thousand students have experienced the curriculum. YESS!/Mini-Society has the distinction of being the only entrepreneurial education program to be named to the U.S. Department of Education's National Diffusion Network (NDS), and NDS has co-sponsored workshop training in the program for

sixty state facilitators. Not limited to traditional public/private school settings, YESS!/Mini-Society is also being used by existing youth organizational networks, such as affiliates of Girls Inc. in thirteen states.

Purpose and Research Questions

The action research project described in this paper focusses on a small group of inservice teachers, some experienced and some inexperienced, who received training in the YESS!/Mini-Society program at the beginning of the 1996-97 school year. The purpose of the project was to explore these teachers' impressions of the YESS!/Mini-Society program before and after program implementation. Knowledge of teachers' pre- and post-implementation ideas could provide a helpful foundation for future teacher training efforts. Specifically, the research questions for the action research project were as follows:

- What are teachers' impressions of the YESS!/Mini-Society program?
- Do these impressions differ before and after program implementation?
- How do the impressions of "experienced" and "inexperienced" teachers compare?

Methodology

Nine inservice teachers participated in the project. Five were "experienced" (with three or more years of teaching experience), and four were "inexperienced" (with no teaching experience). Six of the teachers taught in three different elementary schools within the Denton Independent School District, Denton, Texas, while the remaining three teachers taught in three different elementary schools within the Lewisville Independent School District, Lewisville,

Texas. There were six female and three male teachers. Eight teachers were Caucasian, and the remaining teacher was Hispanic.

All of the subjects participated in a two-day YESS!/Mini-Society workshop conducted at the beginning of the 1996-97 school year. The two days of the workshop emphasized two content areas respectively: (1) "the framework" (i.e. the YESS!/Mini-Society instructional system) and (2) the entrepreneurship concepts/topics to be addressed within the entrepreneurship debriefings. Instructional strategies used during the workshop included the use of short lectures, experienced-based activities (in which the workshop participants "lived" the concepts and strategies being taught), role playing, and various reinforcement activities (e.g., economic fables, games, worksheets). The appendix to this paper contains an outline of all workshop topics and activities for days 1 and 2.

On day 1 of the workshop, participants were introduced to the teaching-learning theories behind YESS!/Mini-Society and to the three phases of the program--getting it started, keeping it going, and moving it ahead. In an accelerated simulation of the program, the teachers experienced both student and teacher responsibilities in setting up the classroom society. They decided on names for their society and currency, designed a classroom currency, decided on payments to get the money into circulation, and applied for jobs as civil servants (i.e. money cutters, treasurer, paymasters). The teachers also had the opportunity to see and/or experience learning center, bulletin board, card game and other ideas for facilitating business activity. Towards the end of day 1, a sample market day and debriefing session were conducted in order to provide a concrete example of "the framework" in operation. The teachers bought and sold goods and services in their classroom marketplace and experienced a debriefing (or interactive

discussion group session) on the concept of cost-benefit analysis. As a culminating activity for the workshop's first day, a class auction was held. This activity served to demonstrate how one "exits" from the YESS!/Mini-Society program.

On day 2 of the workshop, participants were introduced to the entrepreneurship concepts/topics to be taught through YESS!/Mini-Society debriefings. These concepts/topics included the following: opportunity recognition; target market; market survey, demand, risk taking and entrepreneurship; promotional strategies; the expenses of starting a business; sources of capital; competition versus monopoly; price/productivity and comparative advantage; pricing and break-even analysis; keeping records; cash flow; specialization, gentlemen's agreements and legal contracts; and business plans. Short lectures, reinforcement activities (e.g., games, worksheets, interviews, role play), and demonstrations of debriefings were used to help participants internalize this new content.

Recruitment of the teacher-participants for the two-day YESS!/Mini-Society workshop described above was problematic for two reasons. First, neither school district offered any incentive to teachers for receiving training in the program. Second, the YESS!/Mini-Society workshop was in competition with other district inservice opportunities (some required and some optional) that were being heavily promoted by administrators. In order to attract volunteer participants to the YESS!/Mini-Society training, teachers were offered a stipend of \$100 for attending the workshop and a mini-grant of \$100 for establishing their own "teacher warehouse" of raw materials to be used in implementing the program. The stipend was payable in two equal installments--the first immediately after the workshop and the second after thirty sessions of program implementation and completion of a final questionnaire. The original intent was to train

a cohort of experienced teachers concentrated in two elementary schools in the Denton Independent School District. Difficulty in attracting a sufficient number of workshop participants led to the expansion of recruitment efforts to include new, inexperienced teachers and teachers from the nearby Lewisville Independent School District.

For the same reasons as outlined above, the YESS!/Mini-Society workshop was conducted as a two-day "booster workshop." Such abbreviated workshops are usually reserved for teachers who have been trained (and who are implementing) Mini-Society but who need an introduction to the revised YESS!/Mini-Society materials. The subjects in this action research project did not specifically meet this criterion, but all had received instruction in experience-based economics and/or implemented similar experience-based economics programs either as an undergraduate teacher intern (in a Professional Development School) or inservice teacher.

Each participating teacher completed a written questionnaire on his/her impressions of the YESS!/Mini-Society program immediately after the workshop and immediately after thirty sessions of program implementation. The questionnaire featured the first ten questions below at the end of the workshop and all eleven questions below at the end of program implementation:

1. What do you like about the framework?
2. What do you not like about the framework?
3. What do you like about the entrepreneurship debriefings?
4. What do you not like about the entrepreneurship debriefings?
5. Can your students learn the entrepreneurship concepts? Why/why not?
6. What is the key to successfully implementing the framework?
7. What is the key to successfully implementing the entrepreneurship debriefings?

8. What hindrances are there to implementing YESS!/Mini-Society in your classroom?
9. How do you overcome these hindrances?
10. How does YESS!/Mini-Society impact your teaching of social studies? Other subjects?
11. When you implemented YESS!/Mini-Society in your classroom, did you change the program in any way(s)? If so, how and why?

Responding to the written questionnaire required between ten and fifteen minutes. After answering question #11, the teachers were allowed to write any other comments about the program that they desired. Using data analysis procedures as outlined in Brophy, VanSledright, & Bredin (1992), the teachers' responses were analyzed with respect to the qualitative aspects of their thinking about the YESS!/Mini-Society program. Stated more specifically, pre- and post-implementation data were analyzed by (1) identifying categories of responses using constant comparison methods and (2) tallying the number of responses in each category. These categories were developed post facto based on the actual words from obtained student responses. No attempt was made to code the data using categories developed in advance. Two judges independently categorized and tallied the students' responses, and any discrepancies were discussed until consensus was reached.

Results

Tables 1 through 11 summarize the teachers' pre- and post-implementation reactions to the YESS!/Mini-Society program, with response categories and tallies reported for experienced

teachers, inexperienced teachers, and all teachers. The pre-implementation data is complete. All nine teachers (five experienced and four inexperienced) are represented. With respect to the post-implementation reactions, only partial data is currently available. Six of the nine participating teachers (four experienced and two inexperienced) are represented. The three remaining teachers (one experienced and two inexperienced) have yet to complete program implementation and the final post-implementation questionnaire. This missing data should be available by the end of the 1996-97 school year.

Table 1 contains pre- and post-implementation responses to question 1, "What do you like about the framework?" Both pre- and post-implementation responses and both experienced and inexperienced teachers' responses were quite similar for this question, with the most frequent response category referring to the overall clarity and organization of the framework (5, 6). Teachers praised the sequentialness of the program and its easy-to-follow, step-by-step directions. Other pretest responses called attention to the framework's focus on concrete, real-life experiences (2), its focus on decision-making/problem-solving (2) and its flexibility in responding to different purposes, students, and settings (2).

Table 2 features pre- and post-implementation responses to question 2, "What do you not like about the framework?" Prior to implementation, four teachers (three experienced and one inexperienced) expressed no dislikes. Some teachers, especially the inexperienced ones, verbalized anxieties about the complexity of setting up and running the program (3), the difficulty in identifying "triggers" for debriefings--i.e. market day events/problems that served as the focus of discussion (3), and the difficulty in pre-planning--i.e. anticipating and readying oneself to teach concepts/topics as they became relevant to solving market day problems (3). In

contrast, post-implementation responses centered around scope and sequence concerns. Teachers worried about how to cover all the content (2) and in what order to teach the concepts/topics (2).

Question 3 asked, "What do you like about the entrepreneurship debriefings?," and Table 3 conveys teachers' answers. The most frequent pre-implementation responses included the teaching of relevant, valuable decision-making/problem-solving skills (6), students' ownership of learning--considered to be a desirable feature at least among inexperienced teachers (3), the provision of concrete debriefing examples in the teacher's guide (2), the bases of debriefings in students' real-life market day experiences (2), and the provision of reinforcement/extension activities and opportunities for corrective feedback (2). Two of these response categories, the teaching of relevant, valuable decision-making/problem-solving skills (2) and the provision of concrete debriefing examples in the teacher's guide (2), appeared again in teachers' post-implementation responses. Post-implementation responses also included praise for practical aspects of the entrepreneurship debriefings--the ability to easily assess students' learning during debriefing discussions (2) and the convenience and helpfulness of ready-to-use forms within the teacher's guide (2).

Table 4 conveys teachers' pre- and post-implementation responses to question 4, "What do you not like about the entrepreneurship debriefings?" Five teachers before program implementation and two teachers after program implementation cited no dislikes. A range of dislikes were mentioned prior to program implementation. These included difficulty in pre-planning--i.e. anticipating and readying oneself to teach concepts/topics as they became relevant to solving market day problems (1), concern about teaching all of the content within a limited amount of time (1), the difficulty of the entrepreneurship concepts (1), the difficulty of

entrepreneurship concept labels/terminology (1), and the difficulty of interesting all students in each topic (thus necessitating re-teaching)--because debriefings covered problems that did not directly involve all students in the class society (1). Difficulty in pre-planning (1) and concern about teaching all the content within a limited amount of time (1) also appeared among the post-implementation responses, along with dislikes associated with a lack of clear sequence for teaching entrepreneurship concepts/topics (1), uneasiness in letting students (versus the teacher) have control of the learning environment (1), and difficulty in moving students from highly motivating market day periods to less motivating debriefing periods (1). This final concern was tempered by the comment that all students seemed to learn from the debriefing discussions once they got started.

Table 5 summarizes teachers' pre- and post-implementation responses to question 5, "Can your students learn the entrepreneurship concepts? Why/why not?" Prior to and after program implementation, all teachers were in agreement that their students could learn the content. In justifying their responses at the pre-implementation phase, teachers noted the importance of real-life, active experiences (5), developmentally appropriate instruction (3), and attention-focussing debriefings (2) in enhancing students' learning. Real-life, active experiences (3) were cited again after program implementation, but teachers also stressed the necessity of re-visiting/re-teaching entrepreneurship concepts (2) and the difficulty students had in immediately applying new entrepreneurship concepts in a real-world setting (1).

Table 6 contains teachers' pre- and post-implementation responses to question 6, "What is the key to successfully implementing the framework?" The most prevalent pre-implementation responses centered around teacher pacing (2), teacher flexibility (2), teacher organization/

routines (2), teacher knowledge of his/her students (2), and teacher promotion of success/mastery (2). Post-implementation responses, on the other hand, revealed two things--teachers' heavy reliance on following the steps and schedule outlined in the teacher's guide (4) and the fun teachers had in implementing the program which, in turn, engendered excitement/enthusiasm in their students (2).

Table 7 conveys teachers' pre- and post-implementation responses to question 7, "What is the key to successfully implementing the entrepreneurship debriefings?" Pre-implementation responses included two related categories--the teacher listening to students' responses/questions (4) and the teacher observing and identifying appropriate "triggers" for debriefings (2). Similarly, after program implementation, five teachers listed observing and identifying appropriate "triggers" for debriefings. Teacher willingness to let students have control was listed prior to (2) and after (1) program implementation. Unlike teachers' responses to question 6, the post-implementation responses to question 7 did not indicate a heavy reliance on the teacher's guide, for only one teacher mentioned following ideas/suggestions from the teacher's guide as an important factor in successfully implementing the entrepreneurship debriefings. Perhaps the teacher's guide for the entrepreneurship debriefings was not as helpful as the one for the framework. The steps in getting the program started, keeping it going, and moving it ahead were clearly outlined, step-by-step, in the teacher's guide for the framework. In contrast, the teacher's guide for the entrepreneurship debriefings did not (and perhaps could not) provide detailed, step-by-step procedures for every possible debriefing session; instead, narrative descriptions of typical dilemmas and of sample, hypothetical debriefings were provided.

Question 8 asked, "What hindrances are there to implementing YESS!/Mini-Society in your classroom?", and Table 8 conveys teachers' answers. Both pre- and post-implementation responses centered around two categories--time constraints within the required curriculum (5,6) and preparation for state-mandated tests (2,3). Inexperienced teachers' pre-implementation fears included lack of support from administrators and peers (2) and lack of confidence with content and method (2). These fears were not present after program implementation. Instead, inexperienced teachers listed problems such as the inhibiting effects of departmentalization on curriculum integration (1) and communication problems with parents (1). Experienced teachers, in contrast, named time-related problems, such as pull-out programs which removed students from the regular classroom throughout the school day (1) and the overwhelming amount of program content (1).

Table 9 presents teachers' responses to question 9, "How do you overcome these hindrances?" Prior to program implementation, experienced teachers proposed curricular integration as the solution (3) or proposed no solution at all (2). Inexperienced teachers, on the other hand, named a variety of possible solutions such as teacher organization/preparedness (2), curricular integration (1), program modification (1), program promotion (1), and willingness to become a risk-taker in implementing the program (1). After program implementation, both experienced and inexperienced teachers advocated program modifications to fit the existing school curriculum/schedule (3) or the use of creative scheduling to make/find time for the program (3). Awareness of the benefits of curricular integration, in terms of promoting time savings and increased content coverage, seemed to be lost as teachers opted for more easily realized solutions.

Table 10 conveys teachers' pre- and post-implementation responses to question 10, "How does YESS!/Mini-Society impact your teaching of social studies? Other subjects?" Teachers' pre-implementation responses pointed to the program's capacity for advancing curricular integration (7), enhancing students' knowledge/understanding of concepts (5), making learning fun/motivating (3), adding to students' real-life background experiences (3), promoting meaningfulness and student ownership of learning (2), and fostering a feeling of community (2). To a lesser extent, teachers' post-implementation responses focussed on some of the same things--curricular integration (2), students' awareness of interdisciplinary connections (2), and students' acquisition of conceptual knowledge/understanding (2). References to curricular integration appear to point to the interdisciplinary components inherent in YESS!/Mini-Society, rather than to any attempt by teachers to truly integrate program components into the existing school curriculum. Teachers' concerns with time and content coverage, revealed in their answers to previous questions, suggest that most (if not all) teachers viewed YESS!/Mini-Society as a separate, add-on program.

Question 11, "When you implemented YESS!/Mini-Society in your classroom, did you change the program in any way(s)? If so, how and why?," was asked only after program implementation. Again, teachers' responses showed an inordinate concern with time, and many of the changes constituted attempts to make/find time for program implementation within the existing school curriculum. Some changes that were made did not seem to detract from the overall integrity of the program. These inconsequential modifications included changing the recommended schedule and simplifying/shortening certain processes (2), omitting the establishment of a governmental system and government-related debriefings (2), skipping the

teaching of some concepts (1), and not taking bids for flag and currency designs (1). Other changes appeared to partially or wholly contradict the philosophical and theoretical foundations of the program. These more serious modifications included adding behavior-related payments/fines for classroom management purposes--i.e. using teacher-imposed behavior modification (1), making some decisions for students in order to initiate or advance the program (1), teaching some entrepreneurial/business basics before establishing the classroom society (1). Such changes were inconsistent with the program's promotion of self-imposed behavioral change, student autonomy, and meaningful, long-lasting learning based on experienced-based instruction (experience followed by debriefing).

At the end of the pre- and post-implementation questionnaires, teachers were given the opportunity to make additional comments if they so desired. All responses were highly positive. Pre-implementation comments indicated that teachers were looking forward to implementing the program (4), had found the workshop training to be advantageous (1), and anticipated the many benefits the program would have across a diverse student population--including the promotion of success, self-esteem, risk-taking, and creativity (1). Post-implementation comments indicated that the program had been a beneficial learning experience for students (3), a beneficial learning experience for the teacher (1), and an enjoyable/motivating experience for students (2). Individual teachers remarked on the crucial nature of real-life experiences in students' learning (1), the inhibiting effect of departmentalization on curricular integration and on emersion of students in a real-world learning environment (1), and the support received from parents (1).

Discussion

Overall, teachers' impressions of YESS!/Mini-Society were very positive before and after program implementation. Teachers were impressed by the clarity, organization, and sequential nature of the program, especially with respect to the framework. They also praised the practicality and convenience of the ready-to-use instructional materials provided in the teacher's guides. Teachers seemed to "buy into" the philosophical and theoretical foundations of the program, supporting the worth of real-life experiences, active learning, and experience-based instruction. Likewise, the importance/value of programmatic objectives, such as the promotion of entrepreneurship knowledge/skills, problem-solving/decision-making skills, student autonomy, and positive student attitudes toward school/learning (i.e. student interest/motivation) appeared to be widely recognized by participating teachers.

Teachers' fears/concerns centered around three related areas. These areas included the complexity/sophistication of the program, the comprehensiveness of the program, and time. Each of these areas is addressed separately below.

Workshop participants appeared to realize that YESS!/Mini-Society is a complex, sophisticated program that is most successful in the hands of a master teacher. They recognized that identifying "triggers" for debriefings requires a great deal of "withitness" on the part of the classroom teacher, and they saw the need for really knowing the concepts/skills to be taught and being able to debrief these concepts/skills on short notice (based on whatever personal or societal dilemma surfaced on a given market day).

Some teachers seemed to be overwhelmed by the comprehensiveness of the program. They praised the program for crossing disciplinary lines and for teaching an abundance of

content, but, at the same time, seemed to be unable to decide what specific content to teach and when to teach it at their particular grade level. As implied by their responses, a few teachers' falsely assumed that quality, full-fledged program implementation required all YESS!/Mini-Society content to be covered by the teacher in a given school year.

Time was an overriding concern for many teachers. The teachers worried about how to make room for YESS!/Mini-Society in the existing school curriculum and about taking time away from student preparation for state-mandated basic skills tests. They saw the program as an add-on rather than as a complement to local/state curriculum, for they failed to recognize the congruence of programmatic objectives with local/state objectives and the potential for integrating the program into the existing school curriculum.

The findings summarized above have direct implications for those interested in further developing and disseminating the YESS!/Mini-Society program. Teachers obviously could benefit from future YESS!/Mini-Society workshops which address common fears/concerns, and a number of possible means come to mind.

First, teacher trainers need to help teachers see the connections between YESS!/Mini-Society and local/state curricula. The program should be perceived as being in line with, not in competition with, such curricula.

Second, teacher trainers need to help teachers recognize the overlap between knowledge/skills taught by YESS!/Mini-Society and knowledge/skills measured on state-mandated basic skills tests. The program could even be used to enhance students' scores on such tests.

Third, program designers/trainers, in cooperation with schools and school districts committed to program implementation, need to construct a spiral curriculum framework for the program that builds on what students already know. Through the establishment of such a framework for each YESS!/Mini-Society module (entrepreneurship, economics, law/government/ethics, invention society), teachers could learn how to re-visit concepts/topics within and across grade levels, introducing new dimensions and new situations/applications with each successive contact. This spiral curriculum would constitute a suggested scope and sequence for YESS!/Mini-Society content, which could then be reconciled with and integrated into existing local/state curricula. In other words, it would provide more guidance to teachers in terms of what to teach and when to teach it. At first, a suggested scope and sequence may seem contradictory to the experience-based nature of the program, but there is no contradiction. At any given moment within a Mini-Society classroom, a full range of predictable dilemmas are available for debriefing. A suggested scope and sequence would simply help teachers to know what dilemmas to look for next. It would also help them know which concepts/skills to emphasize at their respective grade levels and how to re-visit concepts/skills at increasingly higher levels of attainment.

Fourth, school- and/or district-wide commitment to the program is needed for successful implementation. This commitment could be realized in several ways, such as school- or district-wide training of cohort groups of YESS!/Mini-Society teachers, the establishment of teacher support groups during program implementation, the use of school or district staff to monitor initial implementation efforts, and the encouragement of true integration of the program into the existing school curriculum. This fourth recommendation is in line with current workshop

proposal guidelines from the Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership. These guidelines require mechanisms to foster teachers' commitment to implementation and to provide for follow-up activities and classroom visits/monitoring during implementation.

By following the recommendations outlined above, teachers fears and concerns are likely to be lessened considerably. In addition, teachers may be less likely to engage in program modifications that compromise program integrity.

Future YESS!/Mini-Society Workshops and Action Research Projects

Planning and preparation for our next YESS!/Mini-Society workshop, to be held in the summer of 1997, have already begun. The objectives of this workshop will be for participants to demonstrate/apply knowledge of (1) the YESS!/Mini-Society framework and (2) various entrepreneurship, economics, and government/law/ethics concepts taught within the YESS!/Mini-Society curriculum. Participants in the workshop will receive three semester hours of graduate credit from the University of North Texas, and the course will consist of approximately forty-eight contact hours.

The workshop will be limited to twenty-five inservice teachers in the Plano Independent School District. Preference will be given to intermediate elementary and middle school teachers (grades 3-6) within the UNT-Plano Master's degree program. The workshop will constitute a three-semester hour graduate social studies methods course and will count towards an elective requirement on the Master's degree plan in elementary education. Plano I.S.D. will advertise and recruit participants from among teachers enrolled in the UNT-Plano Master's degree program. Over one hundred elementary and secondary teachers enter this program each year. Plano I.S.D.

requires all teachers who are new to the district to acquire a Master's degree within six years and pays tuition costs of new teachers (and verteran teachers) who enroll in the UNT-Plano program. By the summer of 1997, the third cohort group of teachers will be entering the program.

The workshop will be offered between July 1 and July 31, 1997. There will be a minimum of sixteen sessions, each approximately three hours in length, across a five-week period. The format will include lectures, guided discussions, demonstrations, experience-based activities, role playing, and partial program implementation. As part of a regularly scheduled summer school enrichment program for intermediate grade students within Plano I.S.D., workshop participants will serve as YESS!/Mini-Society teachers, guiding children in the creation of their own classroom society (in accordance with the YESS!/Mini-Society framework) and debriefing relevant entrepreneurship, economics, and government/law/ethics concepts. After the children depart each day, the teacher trainer will debrief teachers on their implementation efforts and prepare teachers for the next day of program implementation.

Workshop content will include (1) the YESS!/Mini-Society framework, (2) entrepreneurship debriefings, (3) economics debriefings, (4) law/government/ethics, and (5) guided practice in applying what is learned within the context of a summer school enrichment program for intermediate grade children. In addition, the program's content will be tied to the new national social studies curriculum standards, the new Texas essential knowledge and skills, and Plano I.S.D.'s current curriculum guides. A suggested scope and sequence of YESS!/Mini-Society concepts/skills within the Plano I.S.D. curriculum is one possible product of this workshop.

Program participants will be asked to implement YESS!/Mini-Society in their own regular classrooms beginning in the fall of 1997. The teacher trainer and social studies coordinator for Plano I.S.D. will conduct two or three follow-up, trouble-shooting meetings during the fall semester. In addition, they will be available for consultation with individual teachers on an "as needed" basis. A questionnaire, similar to the one described in this paper, will be administered prior to and after program implementation to ascertain teachers' reactions to YESS!/Mini-Society.

The UNT-Plano Master's program requires each student to complete a programmatic portfolio. The purpose of the portfolio is for Master's students to document their professional growth through field-based implementation of graduate course content. Documentation of a teacher's implementation of YESS!/Mini-Society in the summer school setting and in his/her regular classroom will be required for students who select the graduate social studies methods course as one of their required electives on the Master's degree plan in elementary education. Lesson plans, children's work, pretest-posttest results, and action research reports relating to YESS!/Mini-Society are all possible forms of documentation that could be included in a candidate's portfolio.

Portfolio development will be monitored by graduate instructors, including social studies educators and/or elementary education generalists, at regular intervals throughout the Master's program. For evaluation purposes in their last education course, Master's students will present their portfolios to a panel comprised of UNT faculty/administrators, Plano administrators/curriculum coordinators, and peers.

The action research project described in this paper brought to light many needs associated with YESS!/Mini-Society training and implementation. Teacher training efforts such as the one described above have the potential for meeting many of these needs.

Bibliography

- Brophy, J., VanSledright, B.A., & Bredin, N. (1992). Fifth-graders' ideas about European exploration of the New World expressed before and after studying this topic within a U.S. history course. *Elementary Subjects Center Series 78*. East Lansing, Michigan: The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.
- Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation (1996). *1996 annual report*. Kansas City, MO: Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (no date). Common sense made difficult: The study of economics. Unpublished paper, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1976). Perceived versus actual risk-taking in Mini-Societies. *The Social Studies*, 67(5), 191-194.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1977). The Kinder-Economy: A case study of kindergarten pupils' acquisition of economic concepts. *Elementary School Journal*, 77(3), 182-191.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1979). Optimal intervention: An empirical investigation of the role of the teacher in experience-based instruction. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 47(4), 3390345.

- Kourilsky, M.L. (1986). School reform: The role of the economic educator. *Journal of Economic Education*, 17, 213-217.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1987). Children's learning of economics: The imperative and the hurdles. *Theory Into Practice*, 26, 198-205.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1993). An integrated teacher education model for enhanced economic literacy of primary teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1995). Entrepreneurship education: Opportunity in search of a curriculum. *Business Education Forum*, October, 11-15.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1996A). *YESS!/Mini-Society, Entrepreneurship: Debriefing teachable moments*. Kansas City, MO: Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership, Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.
- Kourilsky, M.L. (1996B). *YESS!/Mini-Society, The framework: Experiencing the real world in the classroom*. Kansas City, MO: Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership Inc., Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.
- Kourilsky, M.L., & Ballard-Campbell, M. (1984). Mini-Society: An individualized social studies program for children of low, middle, and high ability. *The Social Studies*, 75, 224-228.
- Kourilsky, M.L., & Carlson, S.R. (in press). *Mini-Society and YESS! learning theory in action*. Kansas City, MO: Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership Inc. Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.

Kourilsky, M.L., & Graff, E. (1986). Children's use of cost-benefit analysis: Developmental or non-existent. In S. Hodgkinson and D. Whitehead (Ed.), *Economic education: Research and development issues*. Essex, England: Longman.

Kourilsky, M.L., & Hirschleifer, J. (1976). Mini-Society vs. token economy: An experimental comparison of the effects on learning and autonomy of socially emergent and imposed behavior modification. *Journal of Educational Research*, 69, 376-381.

TABLE 1
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 1
Q1: What do you like about the framework?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
It is clear and organized	3	4	2	2	5	6
It focuses on concrete, real-life experiences	1	1	1	0	2	1
It focuses on decision-making, problem-solving	1	0	1	0	2	0
It is flexible	0	0	2	0	2	0
It provides direct instruction, reinforcement, and extension	0	0	1	0	1	0
It provides interdisciplinary approaches	0	0	1	0	1	0
Its ready-to-use forms are convenient and helpful	0	0	0	1	0	1
It provides for active learning	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 2
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 2
Q2: What do you not like about the framework?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Nothing, no answer	3	1	1	0	4	1
Complexity of setting up, running program	1	0	2	0	3	0
Difficulty in identifying "triggers" for debriefings	1	0	2	0	3	0
Difficulty in pre-planning	1	0	2	0	3	0
Scope of content too broad and recommended/available time frame too short	0	1	1	1	1	2
Modifications required for different learners	0	0	1	0	1	0
Sequence for introducing/teaching concepts unclear	0	1	0	1	0	2
Wordiness	0	1	0	0	0	1
Difficulty in setting up multiple classes/societies simultaneously	0	0	0	1	0	1

TABLE 3
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 3
Q3: What do you like about the entrepreneurship debriefings?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Relevant, valuable decision-making, problem-solving skills are taught	3	2	3	0	6	2
Students have ownership of their learning	0	1	3	0	3	1
Concrete debriefing examples are provided	1	1	1	1	2	2
Debriefings are based on real-life experiences/teachable moments	1	1	1	0	2	1
Reinforcement/extension activities and opportunities for corrective feedback are provided	1	0	1	0	2	0
Activities are fun, meaningful, motivating	1	1	0	0	1	1
Students see purpose/need for learning	0	1	1	0	1	1
Relevant, valuable concepts are taught	1	0	0	1	1	1
Relevant, valuable social skills are taught	1	0	0	1	1	1
Appropriate teaching methods/strategies are used	1	0	0	0	1	0
Debriefing discussions allow teacher to assess student learning	0	2	0	0	0	2
Ready-to-use forms are convenient, helpful	0	1	0	1	0	2

TABLE 4
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 4
Q4: What do you not like about the entrepreneurship debriefings?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Nothing; no answer	3	1	2	1	5	2
Difficulty in pre-planning	1	1	0	0	1	1
Scope of content too broad, and recommended time frame to short	0	0	1	1	1	1
Difficulty of concepts	1	0	0	0	1	0
Difficulty of concept labels/terminology	1	0	0	0	1	0
Difficulty in interesting all students in each topic; need for re-teaching	0	0	1	0	1	0
Difficulty in moving from highly motivating market day to less motivating debriefing	0	1	0	0	0	1
Lack of clear sequence for teaching concepts	0	0	0	1	0	1
Uneasiness in letting students have control	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 5
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 5
Q5: Can your students learn the entrepreneurship concepts? Why/why not?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes : No	5:0	3:0	4:0	1:0	9:0	6:0
Real-life, active experiences enhance learning	2	2	3	1	5	3
Concepts can be taught in developmentally appropriate ways	1	0	2	0	3	0
Debriefings focus students' attention and provide direct instruction on concepts	1	0	1	1	2	1
Learner differences means some will learn more than others	0	0	2	0	2	0
High-level, abstract concepts are difficult	1	0	0	0	1	0
Teacher pacing is important	0	0	1	0	1	0
Teacher selects what concepts to teach	1	0	0	0	1	0
Re-visiting and re-teaching concepts are necessary	0	2	0	0	0	2
Application of concepts in real-world is difficult	0	0	0	1	0	1

TABLE 6
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 6
Q6: What is the key to successfully implementing the framework?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Teacher paces instruction appropriately	1	0	2	0	3	0
Teacher is flexible	0	0	2	0	2	0
Teacher is organized and establishes routines	1	0	1	0	2	0
Teacher knows his/her students	1	0	1	0	2	0
Teacher promotes success/mastery	2	0	0	0	2	0
Teacher has fun and generates excitement/enthusiasm	0	1	1	1	1	2
Teacher does "homework" or prepares appropriately; gives time/effort	0	0	1	1	1	1
Teacher gives purpose/objective	1	0	0	0	1	0
Teacher includes both experience and debriefing	0	0	1	0	1	0
Teacher revisits concepts	1	0	0	0	1	0
Teacher follows steps and schedule in guide	0	3	0	1	0	4
Teacher makes program modifications	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 7
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 7
Q7: What is the key to successfully implementing the entrepreneurship debriefings?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Teacher listens to students' responses, questions	2	0	2	0	4	0
Teacher observes and identifies appropriate "triggers" for debriefings	2	3	0	2	2	5
Teacher is willing to let students have control	0	1	2	0	2	1
Teacher does "homework" or prepares appropriately	0	0	1	0	1	0
Teacher has students keep journals	1	0	0	0	1	0
Teacher includes both experience and debriefing	0	0	1	0	1	0
Teacher moves from beginning- to advanced-level concepts	1	0	0	0	1	0
Teacher paces instruction appropriately	0	0	1	0	1	0
Teacher reinforces and extends concepts in many ways	0	0	1	0	1	0
Teacher re-visits and re-teaches concepts	1	0	0	0	1	0
Teacher teaches concepts in interdisciplinary way	1	0	0	0	1	0
Teacher follows ideas, suggestions in guide	0	1	0	0	0	1
Teacher has students share their successes, failures, problems/conflicts, and solutions	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 8
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 8
Q8: What hindrances are there to implementing YESS!/Mini-Society in your classroom?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Time constraints within required curriculum	3	4	2	2	5	6
Preparation for state-mandated tests	1	2	1	1	2	3
Lack of support from administrators and peers	0	0	2	0	2	0
None; no answer	2	0	0	0	2	0
Teacher confidence with content and method	0	0	2	0	2	0
Space constraints	1	0	0	0	1	0
Departmentalization, which prohibits full integration of subjects	0	0	0	1	0	1
Overwhelming amount of program content	0	1	0	0	0	1
Parents' initial skepticism	0	0	0	1	0	1
Pull-out programs which remove students from the regular classroom throughout the day	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 9
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 9
Q9: How do you overcome these hindrances?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
By integrating the curriculum	3	0	1	1	4	1
By being organized and prepared	0	0	2	0	2	0
No answer	2	0	0	0	2	0
By modifying the program to fit the curriculum and schedule	0	2	1	1	1	3
By becoming a promoter or advocate of the program	0	0	1	0	1	0
By taking a risk and implementing the program	0	0	1	0	1	0
By using creative scheduling	0	2	0	1	0	3
By assigning some tasks as homework	0	0	0	1	0	1
By communicating better with parents	0	0	0	1	0	1

TABLE 10
Pre- and Post-Implementation Responses to Question 10
Q10: How does YESS!/Mini-Society impact your teaching of social studies? Other subjects?

Response	Experienced Teachers		Inexperienced Teachers		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
It promotes curricular integration	3	0	4	2	7	2
It promotes students' knowledge and understanding of concepts	3	2	2	0	5	2
It enhances students' real-life background experiences	1	1	2	0	3	1
It makes learning fun and motivating	0	1	3	0	3	1
It promotes meaningfulness and student ownership of learning	1	0	2	0	3	0
It promotes a feeling of community.	1	1	1	0	2	1
It helps students see relationships between subjects	0	1	1	1	1	2
It enhances students' problem-solving and decision-making skills	0	0	1	0	1	0

TABLE 11
Post-Implementation Responses to Question 11
Q11: When you implemented YESS!/Mini-Society in your classroom,
did you change the program in any way(s). If so, how and why?

Response	Experienced Teachers	Inexperienced Teachers	Total
Changed recommended schedule and simplified/shortened processes because of time constraints	2	0	2
No government was set up because of time constraints	1	1	2
Added behavior-related payments and fines for classroom management purposes	1	0	1
Had students keep journals to help me (teacher) plan debriefings	1	0	1
Made some decisions for students to get program started and move it ahead	0	1	1
No bids were taken for designing flag, currency because of time constraints	1	0	1
Omitted some concepts because of time constraints	0	1	1
Taught some entrepreneurial/business basics <u>before</u> implementing society because of time constraints	0	1	1

APPENDIX

YESS!/MINI-SOCIETY WORKSHOP--DAY 1, THE FRAMEWORK

1. Refreshments; introductions; complete pretest, tax form, personal data form.
2. Definition of entrepreneurship (T2).
3. Rationale for engaging in entrepreneurship education (Laney's notes).
4. Definition of economics.
 - Activity: Producing a product with limited art supplies. Answer the questions: What to produce? How to produce? For whom to produce?
5. Theoretical basis for Mini-Society (T3, T5-7, T4).
6. Research on experience-based vs. experiential learning (Laney's transparencies).
7. Show Mini-Society videotape; show Hotdogaronia videotape.
8. Phases of Mini-Society (T8).
9. Getting it started--teacher responsibilities (T9-10).
 - Activity: Scarcity of apples lesson (Laney's transparencies, T36).
 - Activity: Scarcity fable, cartoon, card game.

LUNCH (11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.)

10. Getting it started--student responsibilities (T11-18).
 - Identify payment activities (T11).
 - Name country, currency.
 - Select currency denominations.
 - Select civil servants, job criteria (T37-39).
 - Design currency, flags; select winning designs.
 - Decide on rent for table/chair space, import fees, business license fees, prices for supplies at classroom warehouse.

CANDY BAR BREAK

11. Facilitating business activity--keeping it going, moving it ahead (T19-25).
 - Show learning center, bulletin board, and card game ideas.
 - Activity: Search yellow pages for Mini-Society business ideas. (Or save this activity for Day 2.)

12. Debriefings and "IRE squared" (T26-28)

- Activity: Conduct a market day; hold a debriefing on cost-benefit analysis.

13. Exiting Mini-Society--the final auction (T35).

- Complete auction data sheet and hold auction.

14. Form two concentric circles and review entrepreneurship education rationale, experience-based learning, and "IRE squared."

YESS!/MINI-SOCIETY WORKSHOP--DAY 2, ENTREPRENEURSHIP

1. Should I become an entrepreneur?--opportunity recognition.

- Show Ch. 1 transparencies.
- Activity: List skills and interests. What kind of business might you want to start? Would there be a market?
- Activity: Search yellow pages for Mini-Society business ideas. (If not done on Day 1.)
- Activity: List business ideas from Day 1. Identify market opportunity each addresses. Use list to recognize additional market opportunities (offer more, better quality, complements/substitutes).

2. Unmasking the customer--target markets.

- Activity: Play target game.
- Show Ch. 2 transparencies.
- Activity: Pick a popular business from Day 1. List features and benefits (reasons for buying).
- Activity: List features, benefits, primary/secondary data sources for hypothetical businesses on pp. 20-27. Use "Target Market Locator Planning Guide."
- Activity: List features, benefits, primary/secondary data sources for businesses from Day 1. Use "Target Market Locator Planning Guide."

3. How do I know anybody will buy my product?--market survey, demand, risk taking, entrepreneurship).

- Show Ch. 3 transparencies.
- Activity: Conduct market survey and create a demand schedule and demand curve.
- Activity: Identify factors that might make people want more/less.
- Activity: Explain the difference between a change in demand and movement along the demand curve.

4. WIIFM-based promotion--promotional strategies.

- Activity: Wrapped present. All of your customers want to know WIIFM! Whoever can figure out WIIFM first gets the box.
- Show Ch. 4 transparencies.
- Activity: Play WIIFM feud game. (See p. 44, #2.)
- Activity: Create business card with logo, slogan or an advertisement (Framework, p. 88).

5. How do I get to the starting line?--expenses of starting a business.
 - Activity: Fill out "Common Expenses of Starting a Business" worksheet on a business idea or on a participant's Day 1 business.
6. We're in the money! Or are we?--sources of capital.
 - Show Ch. 6 transparencies.
 - Activity: Interview workshop participant who has received a business loan, been a business partner, or been a private investor.
 - Activity: Read from D. Kent's Benjamin Franklin: Extraordinary Patriot.
7. But it was my idea--competition and monopoly.
 - Show Ch. 7 transparencies.
 - Activity: Play competition and monopoly learning center game.
 - Activity: Non-price competition. All students have 3 hypothetical T-shirts for sale at \$1/each. How can you make yours more desirable than those of your competitors?
 - Activity: Role play situation where there is only 1 manufacturer of a product and you are dissatisfied with it. Possible solutions: peer pressure, boycotting, competition.

LUNCH (11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.)

8. Should I hire my buddy--price/productivity and comparative advantage.
 - Show Ch. 8 transparencies plus look at pp. 76-77.
 - Activity: Compute answers to #2-3, pp. 77-78. (Also on Ch. 8 transparency.)
 - Activity: Explain #4, p. 78. (Also on Ch. 8 transparency.)
 - Activity: Role play #2-3 based on added information from #5, p. 78. (Also on Ch. 8 transparency.)
9. Stay tuned for the price is right!--pricing and break-even analysis.
 - Activity: Write TRIFOP on chalkboard. Say, "Today we're going to solve this word puzzle." Show pan balance with "revenue" on lighter pan and "expenses" on heavier pan. Ask, "What would happen to the business?" Switch cards. Say, "Describe the health of the business now."
 - Show 1st Ch. 9 transparency. Say, "Pricing is one of the main keys to turning the jumbled puzzle TRIFOP into PROFIT."
 - Show remaining Ch. 9 transparencies.
 - Activity: Do calculations for the "Help Sean" and "Help Jerry Lynn" worksheets. Calculate break-even points for Sean and Jerry Lynn using the "How to Calculate Break-Even Point" worksheet (pp. 98-99).
10. Keeping records, starring "sales and expenses"--record keeping.
 - Show Ch. 10 transparencies and role play debriefings.
 - Activity: Create a cash sales receipt for a hypothetical business with logo, slogan.

CANDYBAR BREAK

11. Winning the "go with the flow!" game--cash flow.
 - Show Ch. 11 transparencies.
 - Activity: Make up a hypothetical cash flow forecast which exhibits a cash flow problem. Identify problem and suggest a solution. Use "Cash Flow Forecast" worksheet.
12. I've grown allergic to my partner!--specialization, gentlemen's's agreements, legal contracts).
 - Show Ch. 12 transparencies.
 - Activity: List Mini-Society jobs from Day 1. Which one would you do best/worst?
 - Activity: Assembly line (specialization) demonstration--the widget factory.
13. Triggers
 - Activity: Identify entrepreneurship concepts to debrief in response to trigger events.
14. Review
 - Activity: Write something you learned that you did not know before on a small piece of paper. Place paper inside a balloon and blow up the balloon. Balloons of all participants are placed on the floor. Individual participants select a balloon and break it. Individuals share what is written on the piece of paper from inside the balloon they selected.
15. Complete posttest and questionnaire.